

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claim 12 stands objected to for informality. Claims 13 and 14 stand objected to due to their dependence from claim 12.

Claims 1 – 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,245,219 (*Tan*).

Claims 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Tan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,799 (*Ono*).

Claims 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Summary of Response to the Office Action

Applicant amends the Title of the Invention. Applicant cancels claims 1-10 and 15. Applicant amends claim 12 to correct informality. Applicant rewrites amends 11-14, 16, and 17 to place them in condition for allowance and correct various informalities. No new matter has been added. Claims 11-14, 16, and 17 are pending for consideration.

The Objection to Claim 12

Claim 12 stands objected to for an informality. In response, Applicant amends claim 12 in accordance with the comments of the Office Action, and requests that the objection to claim 12 be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment does not narrow the intended scope of the claim, and therefore Applicant does not intend to relinquish any subject matter by this amendment.

All Claims As Amended Comply with 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1 – 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,245,219 (*Tan*). Claims 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Tan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,373,799 (*Ono*). Claims 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.¹

In response, Applicant cancels claims 1-10 and 15, and rewrites claim 11 in independent form with the limitations of original claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that amended claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 12 – 14, 16, and 17 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies from claim 11, and for the reasons set above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103 should be withdrawn.

#

¹ Applicant presumes that claim 12, which depends from claim 11, would also be allowable if claim 11 were written in independent form to include the limitations of original claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: July 7, 2008

By: Robert T. Burns
Robert T. Burns, Jr.
Reg. No. 60,545

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Customer No.: 009626
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001